

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATLANTA DIVISION**

**AUTOMED TECHNOLOGIES,  
INC.,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**KNAPP LOGISTICS &  
AUTOMATION, INC. and KNAPP  
LOGISTIK AUTOMATION  
GmbH,**

**Defendants.**

**1:04-cv-1152-WSD**

**OPINION AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Knapp Logistics and Automation, Inc.’s (“Knapp US”) Supplement to Defendants’ Bills of Costs [198]. Knapp US advises the Court that “branding” entails costs for “the process of electronically applying bates numbering and confidentiality designations to documents that were produced to Automed in Electronic format . . . .” (Supplement to Defendants’ Bills of Costs at 2.) “Branding” bates numbers or confidentiality designations onto documents is not a cost reasonably necessary to the litigation. See e.g., Williams v. Taser Intern., Inc., slip. op., 2006 WL 1835437, \*6 (N.D.Ga., June 30, 2006)(“Under no

circumstances, however, shall Plaintiff be required to bear any other costs . . . .  
[including] labeling responsive documents. . . ). Automed Technologies shall be  
taxed \$33,757.85 (\$43,912.61 previously assessed by the Court – \$6,137.84  
scanning cost – \$4016.92 “branding” cost)

Based on the foregoing,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Automed Technologies shall be  
taxed \$33,757.85 in costs.

**SO ORDERED** this 30th day of October, 2006.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM S. DUFFEY, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE